REMARKS

The withdrawal, at last, of the prior rejection is acknowledged.

The rejection under 35 USC 102 for anticipation is now from art (Griffith 4,330,723) newly cited after two RCE's. As a result, the applicant reverts to original disclosure of and claim 1 to a current generation circuit and not just the preferred embodiment 124 thereof that was identified as the bootstrap circuit in the Response of October 11, 2005. Neither new matter nor constructive election are, therefore, involved.

Claim 5 now includes a specific transistor arrangement of the current generation circuit that are not found in the Griffith patent. Therefore, the rejection for anticipation is traversed.

The rejection for anticipation should not be converted into one for obviousness, either, because the specific transistor arrangement is one of others that could be made, as shown by the previously cited Berringer, et al. patent, for example. Selection of the arrangement claimed is, therefore, neither optimization nor trial and error such as could negate the patentability of the selection thereof.

In the embodiment now of claim 5, the current generation circuit has a transistor Q2 which has the same electrical characteristic as a transistor Q1 of the output circuit 23 which is connected in series. Thus, a base current of the transistor Q2 is equal to abase current of the transistor Q1. The base current of the transistor Q2 becomes a collector current of a transistor Q3 by the action of a mirror circuit consisting of the transistor Q3 and a transistor Q4. Since the collector of the transistor Q3 is connected to the base of the transistor Q1, a current supplied to the base of the transistor Q1 of the output circuit 23 from a delay circuit is reduced, resulting in an effect of heightening the input impedance of the output circuit. Claim

1 is amended so as to clarify this operations or functions.

Therefore, according to the present invention, by the function of the current generation circuit, it becomes possible to eliminate the influence of attenuation caused by the delay current.

To the contrary, the operations or functions of the circuit the Examiner lists on page in the rejection comments are totally different from those of the present invention.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930